

JAN 03 2007

OHYA, et al., 10/815,705  
03 January 2007 Amendment  
Responsive to 03 October 2006 Office Action

500.43733X00 / W1517-01EF  
Page 17

**REMARKS**

This paper is responsive to any paper(s) indicated above, and is responsive in any other manner indicated below.

**PENDING CLAIMS**

Claims 1-11 were pending, under consideration and subjected to examination in the Office Action. Appropriate claims have been amended, canceled and/or added (without prejudice or disclaimer) in order to adjust a clarity and/or focus of Applicant's claimed invention. That is, such changes are unrelated to any prior art or scope adjustment and are simply refocused claims in which Applicant is present interested. Added dependent claims 12-19 substantially parallel dependent apparatus claims 3-10, respectively. At entry of this paper, Claims 1 and 3-19 will be pending for further consideration and examination in the application.

**'112, 2ND PAR. REJECTION - OBLIVIATED VIA CLAIM AMENDMENT**

Claims 8-10 have been rejected under 35 USC '112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the concerns listed within the section numbered "3" on page 2 of the Office Action. Claims 8-10 have been carefully reviewed and carefully amended where appropriate in order to address the Office Action listed concerns. As the foregoing is believed to have addressed all '112 second paragraph concerns, reconsideration and withdrawal of the '112 second paragraph rejection are respectfully requested.

JAN 03 2007

OHYA, et al., 10/815,705  
03 January 2007 Amendment  
Responsive to 03 October 2006 Office Action

500.43733X00 / W1517-01EF  
Page 18

**ALL REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC '102 AND '103 - TRAVERSED**

All 35 USC rejections are respectfully traversed. However, such rejections have been rendered obsolete by the present clarifying amendments to Applicant's claims, and accordingly, traversal arguments are not appropriate at this time. However, Applicant respectfully submits the following to preclude renewal of any such rejections against Applicant's clarified claims.

All descriptions of Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments regarding the applied prior art, as previously submitted by Applicant in any form, are repeated and incorporated hereat by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the prior art rejections are respectfully traversed. As additional arguments, Applicant respectfully submits the following.

In order to properly support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection, any applied art reference must disclose each and every limitation of any rejected claim. The applied art does not adequately support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection because, at minimum, such applied art does not disclose (or suggest) the following discussed limitations of Applicant's claims.

More particularly, Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention is directed toward providing information processing arrangements which allow sensitive electronic files to be either perfectly deleted (i.e., both the actual electronic file AND its master file management information), OR imperfectly deleted (i.e., only the actual electronic file is deleted, while the master file management information is maintained). The imperfect deletion option is important where one must prove to another (e.g., due to contractual obligations) that the electronic file was appropriately

OHYA, et al., 10/815,705  
03 January 2007 Amendment  
Responsive to 03 October 2006 Office Action

500.43733X00 / W1517-01EF  
Page 19

handled during the life of the electronic file. That is, an entity of interest may receive and review the non-deleted master management information, to verify the propriety of electronic file handling.

In terms of distinguishing claim features/limitations regarding these two differing deletion operations, independent claim 1, for example, recites: "a mode determination module responsive to the deletion target extraction module, which determines whether deletion mode information included in the deletion request indicates a self-destructive mode requesting deletion of the management master information as well as deletion of the management target file; a file deletion module which executes the deletion of the management target file from the storage device in response to a first determination result by the mode determination module indicating that the deletion mode information does not indicate the self-destructive mode; ...a management master information deletion module which locates the management master information of the management target file which has been registered with the file management database, and deletes the management master information AND the management target file in response to a second determination result by the mode determination module indicating that the deletion mode information indicates the self-destructive mode." Independent claim 11 has similar or analogous features/limitations.

Turning now to rebuttal of the applied art, Serbinis et al. (as a primary reference), nowhere discloses or suggests any type of arrangement providing Applicant's two differing deletion operations, and especially Applicant's second

OHYA, et al., 10/815,705  
03 January 2007 Amendment  
Responsive to 03 October 2006 Office Action

500.43733X00 / W1517-01EF  
Page 20

imperfect deleting option (i.e., where only the actual electronic file is deleted, while the master file management information is maintained). Further, as none of the other applied references cure the major deficiency mentioned with respect to the Serbinis et al. reference, it is respectfully submitted that no applied combination of the references would have disclosed or suggested, Applicant's presently-claimed invention.

In addition to the foregoing, the following additional remarks from Applicant's foreign representative are also submitted in support of traversal of the rejection and patentability of Applicant's claims.

One feature of Applicant's invention is focused to determine whether a "self-destructive mode" (which is a mode of requesting deletion of management master information) is indicated, e.g., as shown in example step 1077 in Applicant's Fig. 8. In other words, the feature of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1, with further associated clarification being added. The prior art rejection of claims is respectfully traversed based on the feature.

Regarding such features of Applicant's invention, the object of this invention is a technology of managing information such as secret information which is used or has already been used in applications or business operations so-called "outsourcing", as described in the description of background of the invention. In the outsourcing (ASP), a trustee may bear the responsibility of management and accountability to a truster. The trustee, upon a truster request, must manage the secret information securely, and may be asked to provide proof/explanation proving proper management of the secret information completely.

OHYA, et al., 10/815,705  
03 January 2007 Amendment  
Responsive to 03 October 2006 Office Action

500.43733X0D / W1517-01EF  
Page 21

To solve the problem, with Applicant's invention, the trustee may control whether the "management master information" is deleted together with target information to be deleted, or is left as it is. In short, when it may be necessary to explain corroboratively that the deleted information has been managed securely before it was deleted, the management master information (which is so-called "a log") is held or left without being deleted. When the trustee does not want to hold the fact that the deleted information has been managed securely, the management master information may be indicated to be deleted together with the information (i.e., electronic file) to be deleted.

To this end, Applicant's invention uses a "self-destructive mode (mode of deleting management master information as well as information to be deleted)". That is, it is determined whether "a self-destructive mode" is indicated or absent. If the mode is present, the management master information, as well as the information to be deleted (e.g., electronic file), is deleted. If the mode is absent, the "management master information" is left without being deleted. This invention has the above-mentioned control feature.

In any event, Applicant's invention is not merely to delete information to be deleted and also simultaneously delete its associated information, but is to enable control of information (such as management master information) associated with target information to be deleted, in accordance with the necessity of deletion of the associated information.

Turning now to differences between this invention and the cited references, Serbinis (US Patent 6,584,466) upon which claims 1-2, 4; 6-7 and 11 are rejected as being anticipated, discloses in col.8, lines 20-24 "the physical file corresponding to

OHYA, et al., 10/815,705  
03 January 2007 Amendment  
Responsive to 03 October 2006 Office Action

500.43733X00 / W1517-01EF  
Page 22

the document instance is removed/deleted from the storage and the corresponding document store record is deleted. These document instances are removed from DBM database 25 only when the corresponding transaction is billed and removed from database 25."

The Examiner asserts on page 4 that the condition of transaction log in Serbinis can be interpreted as a mode requesting the deletion both file and file record (that is Applicants' self-destructive mode"). However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's assertion is improper for the reasons below.

More particularly, as mentioned above, the cited transaction log may be assumed (for present argument purposes) to correspond to Applicants' management master information, but not information for controlling deletion of other information. This is apparent from the Serbinis' disclosure that the transaction log itself is to be deleted. In short, the transaction log itself does not work with other information to control deletion of the other information.

In addition, if the transaction log works to delete itself, then other information will be deleted. With such configuration, it is not possible to control to selectively perform an event 1) that one information is deleted the other information is left, and another event 2) that both information is deleted.

Rather in the cited Serbinis, there are an event 1') that if the transaction log is deleted, the physical file and the document instance corresponding to the physical file both are deleted, and another event 2') that if the transaction log is left, the physical file and the document instance corresponding to the physical file both are left. Thus, the Serbinis events indicate selection of all or nothing. Therefore, the

JAN 03 2007

OHYA, et al., 10/815,705  
03 January 2007 Amendment  
Responsive to 03 October 2006 Office Action

500.43733X00 / W1517-01EF  
Page 23

amended independent claims 1 and 11 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited Serbinis patent (alone or in combination with any other references).

As a result of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art would not support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection or '103 obviousness-type rejection of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of such '102 and '103 rejections, and express written allowance of all of the rejected claims, are respectfully requested.

#### **EXAMINER INVITED TO TELEPHONE**

The Examiner is herein invited to telephone the undersigned attorneys at the local Washington, D.C. area telephone number of 703/312-6600 for discussing any Examiner's Amendments or other suggested actions for accelerating prosecution and moving the present application to allowance.

#### **RESERVATION OF RIGHTS**

It is respectfully submitted that any and all claim amendments and/or cancellations submitted within this paper and throughout prosecution of the present application are without prejudice or disclaimer. That is, any above statements, or any present amendment or cancellation of claims (all made without prejudice or disclaimer), should not be taken as an indication or admission that any objection/rejection was valid, or as a disclaimer of any scope or subject matter. Applicant respectfully reserves all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any/all previously claimed limitations/features which have been subsequently amended or cancelled, or to

JAN 03 2007

OHYA, et al., 10/815,705  
03 January 2007 Amendment  
Responsive to 03 October 2006 Office Action

500.43733X00 / W1517-01EF  
Page 24

any/all limitations/features not yet claimed, i.e., Applicant continues (indefinitely) to maintain no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of subject matter of the present application to the public.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims listed above as presently being under consideration in the application are now in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR '1.136. Authorization is herein given to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees and excess claim fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (Case No. 500.43733X00) and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Based upon all of the foregoing, allowance of all presently-pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Paul J. Skwierawski  
Registration No. 32,173

PJS/slk  
(703) 312-6600